

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 28 2006

REMARKS

Independent claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benninghoff and Don in view of Grout. This is the same ground of rejection cited in the previous office action. However, in the present office action, the Examiner cites column 1, lines 1 - 46, and FIG. 2A of Grout as teaching the inserting, retrieving, and removing steps of claim 7. Applicants disagree with this citation for the following reason.

Claim 7, as amended in the previous office action, clearly requires that a document be retrieved in response to the fields which are retrieved from the mailfile stored on the server, in response to the request received for the document which has a section. The server has to insert a URL into the document to retrieve the section.

Claim 7 also requires that the server retrieve the section from the mailfile and create an object having the section expanded in the retrieved document, and the server removes the URL from the retrieved document.

Grout does not describe a server performing these important inserting a URL, retrieving a section, creating an object having the section expanded in the document, and removing the URL steps. Grout clearly describes in column 1, lines 1 - 46, a client browser requesting a document by its URL, receiving the

END920030038US1

10/603,999

document which may itself have embedded URL's linking to objects, and the client browser, not the server, downloading the linked objects for presentation. FIG. 2A merely shows a document having linked objects at a client computer. Some of the linked objects are stored on the client computer so that the client browser does not have to request these from a server over a network, thus reducing network traffic. There is no description in FIG. 2A of the important steps just mentioned which must be performed by the server in applicant's claim 7.

Neither Benninghoff, nor Grout, nor Don describes these steps. Claim 7 is therefore allowable. Likewise, independent claim 16 is allowable for the same reasons. All of the remaining claims depend directly or indirectly on these allowable claims and are therefore also allowable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allowance of all of the pending claims.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the

END920030038US1

10/603,999

application in condition for allowance without further
proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 07/28/06

By: John R. Pivnichny
John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358

Fax: (607)429-4119

END920000051US1

09/551,673

-4-